

Remarks

In response to the Final Office Action dated May 4, 2006, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks.

In the present application, claims 1, 17, and 20 have been amended and claims 4-7 have been cancelled, without prejudice. The claims have been amended to clarify that upon receiving a request from a wireless communication device, an e-mail address identified with the wireless communication device is compared against a list of e-mail addresses residing at the e-mail server, and if the identified e-mail address is on the list, then authorizing access to the private database, and if the identified e-mail address is not on the list, then denying the request to access the information in the private database. The claims have also been amended to clarify the information in the private database comprises a list of documents which are listed by order of relevance. Support for these amendments may be found in paragraphs 0013, 0015, and 0016 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, claims 1-17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gromelski et al. (U.S. 6,377,161, hereinafter “Gromelski”). Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gromelski in view of Purcell (U.S. 5,940,807).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-17 and 20 are rejected as being anticipated by Gromelski. Claims 4-7 have been cancelled, without prejudice, rendering the rejection of these claims moot. The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies a method for accessing information in a private database. The method includes, at an e-mail server, receiving a request from a wireless communication device to access the information in the private database; upon receiving the

request, comparing an e-mail address identified with the wireless communication device against a list of e-mail addresses residing at the e-mail server, and if the identified e-mail address is on the list, then authorizing access to the private database; sending a query to retrieve the information; receiving a response to the query, wherein the response includes the information, wherein the information comprises a list of documents which are listed by order of relevance; sending the information to the wireless communication device; and if the identified e-mail address is not on the list, then denying the request to access the information in the private database.

It is respectfully submitted that Gromelski fails to teach each and every feature specified in amended independent claim 1. For example, Gromelski fails to disclose comparing the email address of a wireless communication device against a list of e-mail addresses at an e-mail server to allow or deny a request to access information in a private database or that the information in the private database comprises a list of documents which are listed by order of relevance. In contrast, Gromelski discloses a subscriber database 320 (see Figure 3) for storing profiles defining a service for a subscriber (see column 4, lines 16-19). Gromelski further discloses a communication system which includes portable messaging units (PMUs). A first PMU may send a message comprising address information to a second PMU via a controller which may access the subscriber database and generate an address information packet. The subscriber database stores profiles defining service for subscribers using the communication system. Upon receiving the address information message, the second PMU checks an internal address book to determine if the received address information is stored therein. If the address information is identical to address information stored in the internal address book, then the PMU stores the address information in memory space (in the PMU) for recent addresses. If the address

information is not identical, then the PMU gives a user the opportunity to store the new address information (see column 4, line 17 through column 5, line 63).

Thus, based on the foregoing, Gromelski fails to disclose authorizing access to a private database based on comparing a wireless device e-mail address against a list of e-mail addresses residing at the e-mail server (the comparison in Gromelski is only concerned with storing address information in a PMU and thus does not result in the granting of access to the subscriber database – in Gromelski the subscriber database is accessed to generate a message packet for sending from the first PMU to the second PMU). Gromelski also fails to disclose denying access to a private database based on the comparison (as noted above, the comparison in Gromelski is not concerned with accessing a private database) and information may still be stored in the PMU, even as the result of a negative comparison. Gromelski also fails to disclose that the information in the private database comprises a list of documents which are listed by order of relevance. The subscriber database disclosed by Gromelski merely stores profiles defining a service for a subscriber.

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 2-3 and 8-16 depend from amended independent claim 1 and thus specify at least the same features. Therefore, these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Amended independent claims 17 and 20 specify similar features as amended independent claim 1 and thus are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 2-3, 8-17, and 20 should also be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 18 and 19 are rejected as being unpatentable over Gromelski in view of Purcell.

The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claims 18 and 19 specify at least the same features as amended independent claim 17. As discussed above Gromelski fails to disclose each of the features specified in amended independent claim 17. Purcell, relied upon to cure the deficiencies of Gromelski, is only concerned with providing product and service information to buyers and users by providing access to a database for exchanging sales information (see column 6, lines 4-15). However, neither Gromelski nor Purcell, alone or in combination, discloses each of the features specified in claims 18 and 19. Therefore, claims 18-19 are allowable and the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

No extension of time fees are believed due at this time. However, please charge any additional fees due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 2, 2006

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III, Reg. #47299

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, GA 30007-1355
(404) 849-2093